

Susan B. Anthony, Branch Rickey, Studs Terkel, Irving "Kup" Kupcien, Lionel Hampton, Senators Paul Douglas, Charles Perry, and Adlai Stevenson, Oprah Winfrey, Scottie Pippen, Patti LaBelle, Oscar Brown, Jr., Ossie Davis, Ruby Dee, Mayor Willie Brown, Jr., and of course Chicago's magnificent mayor, Harold Washington.

□ 1915

Quinn Chapel has been pastored by a succession of extraordinarily devoted, talented, dedicated, and unique individuals who have left their imprint on the church and the community. Those dynamic pastors have come all the way from Archibald Carey to Thomas M. Higginbotham, who is currently there. These individuals have contributed significantly to the development of African-American life.

I salute and commend them on the occasion of their 150th year celebration, and I urge that we all take note of their mammoth contributions to the development of African-American life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GRANGER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KINGSTON, addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TIME FOR MEANINGFUL CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Madam Speaker, once again, I want to thank the staff for being here this evening to let us talk about the issues of campaign finance reform.

Madam Speaker, we call these special orders. The reason we have to talk about these during this time of special orders is because the Republican leadership will not let the matter of campaign finance reform be brought to the floor of the House for a meaningful discussion. It is something that I do not understand and want to talk about more, but I appreciate the staff being here.

Madam Speaker, on June 11, 1995, this was the famous photo between the President and the Speaker of the House, I believe it was in New Hampshire, in which they shook hands and committed themselves to working on campaign finance reform. This weekend I was shocked to hear the Speaker once again reiterate what he thinks campaign finance reform is, which is unlimited donations, that is right, absolutely no cap whatsoever on the ability of an individual to give money to a campaign.

Would \$1,000 be good? Yes. Would \$10,000 be good? Yes. Would \$20,000 be a legal donation? Yes. Would a Ted Turn-

er \$1 billion donation be legal under the Speaker's definition of meaningful campaign finance reform? That is what he said this weekend, and that is the position that he is advocating. That is contrary to the position of the American people.

Madam Speaker, this weekend I was in Arkansas and the President was there. He has had a good week. It has been a great week for Arkansas, talking about the Rock 9. But the President has confirmed his support for campaign finance reform. It was interesting to me that in Arkansas in 1990 when the legislature thwarted the effort to have some meaningful campaign finance reform, President, then Governor Clinton, called a special session. When that was unsuccessful he led the effort to get an initiated act with signatures on the ballot that is now the current law of Arkansas.

The President is committed, the American people are committed. It is the Republican leadership in this House that needs to let this body bring the issue of campaign finance reform, meaningful campaign finance reform, to the American people.

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Speaker, just in line with what the gentleman is saying, I note that what the Speaker is talking about in terms of unlimited campaign contributions is, in essence, as one editorial says, trying to paste on the label of reform without the content.

I think that finally the majority party and the Speaker in particular are starting to hear the voices of America coming forward and saying they will not tolerate inaction on campaign finance reform, and clearly, that majority party, led by its Speaker, do not want to have any real meaningful campaign finance reform, so they are doing just that, trying to paste on the label of reform without the content by saying that they want to reform it by lifting all the rules, and have people have unlimited individual contributions, and then in the next step, they go on to ban so-called soft money.

Madam Speaker, soft money was there just to beat the limits. So if we remove the limits on contributions, we do not need the soft money. In effect, we just open it right up and you can buy any vote you want. It is just unlimited money coming in and basically, again, trying to disarm one party, leaving a party that traditionally gets enormous amounts of money from very wealthy interests to have their day. Editorials have already started to see through this ploy. I think the American people have seen through it long before.

Mr. SNYDER. If I might reclaim my time for a moment, what is discouraging about the Speaker's position is that there are Republicans who are advocating for meaningful campaign fi-

nance reform, and we are going to hear from at least one this evening on this issue. So I do not understand the motivation, trying to block meaningful campaign finance reform from coming to the floor of the House.

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I think the picture reminds me that most of us in politics are well aware that the basic currency of politics is your word. You give your word to your constituents. You give your word to your colleague. You give your word to the voters.

The Speaker here and the President gave their word that they would pursue campaign finance reform. Yet, the Speaker refuses to test a date for campaign finance reform, to make it part of the agenda for the House of Representatives, and we are getting very close to the end of this session. The word, the promise that he made over 2 years ago, should be kept with the American people. It should be kept with the Members of this House.

That is what our efforts have been trying to do, is to make sure that in fact campaign finance reform, and I appreciate the gentleman's involvement in helping us, becomes a fact; that we get a chance to debate it in a full and open and fair manner, and to live up to the promise that the gentleman reminds us the Speaker made over 2 years ago.

I thank the gentleman for taking the well on behalf of campaign finance reform.

Mr. SNYDER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

I now yield to the other gentleman from California, who has been a leader on campaign finance reform for several years.

Mr. FARR of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

I would like to point out that that handshake is reflective of something that Congress has been able to do. We have been able to pass campaign reform. In 1976 was the first effort to try to set the limits that are now in law, much of the law in this country.

URGING CONSERVATIVE COLLEAGUES TO SUPPORT MEANINGFUL CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge support of my colleagues for campaign finance reform. I want to recognize the remarks made by my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. SNYDER], who is a cosponsor of the Freshman Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act, which we are trying to move

forward in this body. I want to particularly make reference to it for a few moments today to urge my colleagues, and particularly my conservative colleagues, to consider campaign finance reform.

I do not believe that campaign finance reform particularly is of any ideological persuasion, but I think the conservatives have been more reluctant, for various reasons, to join the effort to reform our campaign finance system. I think they can join the effort.

First of all, I am a conservative. I am very much in support of, as a former State party chairman, reforming our campaign system. If we look at the campaign finance reform ideas out on the table, we first have to acknowledge that there are some bad ideas out there. There are some ideas that I would not support, but then there are some other ideas for reform that are consistent with conservative principles.

I would not support, for instance, public funding of primaries. I would not support mandatory spending limits. But I do support reforms that stop the abuses of soft money, and I think that is what we need to address.

I have sponsored, along with the gentleman from Maine, Mr. TOM ALLEN, across the aisle, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act of 1997. It is a good bill that bans soft money, that increases disclosure to the American public of what is being spent. In addition, it helps the parties in reference to raising hard money, the honest money. It empowers individuals and slows down the influence of special interest groups. So it is a good bill and it is based upon conservative principles.

In addition to the gentleman from Maine, Mr. TOM ALLEN, and myself sponsoring this, we have numerous other Members. In fact, we have one of the leading bills for cosponsorship from both sides of the aisle. That is why it is of a bipartisan nature. When I look at conservative principles I think of the free market system, I think of individual liberty, I think of smaller government, and I think of a strong defense. This bill really helps us to move in all of those things.

When we look at a free market, we have a free market system because we are able to control monopolies, and say monopolies cannot work because they infringe upon the free market system. Yet, we look at the free market system of ideas and they are being infringed upon by the international corporations that have such an undue influence on our political system.

So this bill levels the playing field, creates really a free market out there, empowers individuals. It encourages individual liberty by empowering individuals. It emphasizes those people who work at the grass roots rather than those people who simply try to generate gross profits. That empowers individuals.

Why does it encourage smaller government? Because if we do not act for

reform now, the call for public funding of our campaigns will grow and grow. We do not need the Government involved. We need to stop the abuse with campaign finance reform now.

Finally, a strong defense, if we can stop the foreign influence, and it will be reduced if we can eliminate the loophole of soft money.

For all of these reasons, the bill, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act, is solid. It is based upon conservative principles. It will stop the abuses, and when I talk across this country, people of all ideological persuasions understand the need for honest, legitimate reform.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support this. Whether they call themselves a liberal, whether they call themselves a conservative, or whether they call themselves a moderate, this is reform that the American public demands across the aisle. Our bill is consistent with conservative principles. I urge my colleagues to support it.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, let me begin by commending our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], for the remarks that he just made. I think that he made some very good points about the need for us to address this whole issue of soft money, and I fully support the initiative that he and our colleague, the gentleman from Maine, Mr. TOM ALLEN, and other freshmen Members, against considerable resistance, have maintained in offering the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act.

Madam Speaker, indeed, I was the Member who stood here on the floor last Friday and asked Speaker GINGRICH personally when he was in the Chair to grant us consent to take up and consider that bill last week. It seemed to me appropriate that we should be considering campaign finance reform on the same day that our colleagues across the hall in the United States Senate were considering that issue last Friday, but instead, we were denied that opportunity.

It seems to me that the kind of bipartisanship that the gentleman from Arkansas has just demonstrated in working, both Democrats and Republicans together, to address this issue is the very kind of bipartisanship that has existed in the Senate, with the leadership of Senator MCCAIN joining with Senator FEINGOLD to propose realistic ways in which we can address this problem of the money chase that affects people of all political philosophies in both parties, devoting in many cases more time to finding the funds to maintain themselves in office or to achieve office than to attend to the public's business.

So I would say, first, I come tonight to agree with my Republican colleague,

and I will say secondly that I agree with comments that many of our Republican colleagues have made on this floor recently concerning the need to enforce existing campaign finance laws.

I read with alarm the reports in the New York Times and otherwise about three campaign aides to the Teamster chief making guilty pleas about illegal money and reelection of the Teamsters tied to a scheme including Democrats. There are already three people that have pled guilty. I want to see that fully and thoroughly investigated, fully and thoroughly prosecuted, along with any other violation by anyone on either side of the political aisle, the political philosophy, of our existing laws.

The problem that brings us here tonight, because we are not an enforcement body of existing laws, is not those existing laws and such violations as may or may not have occurred. To me the problem is that what is legal is not right.

What is legal under existing campaign finance laws is the ability of special interests to pour in millions and millions of dollars that influences what happens in this Congress every day and every evening. What is legal is not right, by the view of the American people, who watch their Congress coming increasingly under the control of special interests who can afford to dump more and more money, soft money, to soften up the political process.

What I find indeed amazing were the comments this weekend of colleagues, both Speaker GINGRICH here in the House and various Members of the other body, saying that they had a solution to the problem of campaign finance reform. What is their solution? They do not think we have enough money in the system. They think that all of the existing reforms in terms of campaign finance limitation, they want to have campaign finance reform by repealing the existing laws and by allowing anyone to pay whatever it costs to buy whatever it is they need in the political process.

I do not believe that people who have studied our system, the ordinary person who is out there working, trying to make ends meet, that they begin to believe the nonsense of those who perhaps have spent too much time focused on how to raise the money for the next campaign instead of how to make ends meet out in the real world; that anyone out there with good sense, looking at this system, thinks that we can make it better if we allow the big boys to pour in even more money than they are funneling into the system already; money that distorts the legislative priorities, that results in a tobacco company being able to come in here and give more soft money to the Republican Party than any other special interest in the first 6 months of this year, and then come along in month 7 and they get a \$50 billion tax break tucked into page 300-and something of